



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Ms Rosalind Ramsey: Professional conduct panel outcome

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the
Secretary of State for Education**

July 2016

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
E. Decision and reasons	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher: Ms Rosalind Ramsey
Teacher ref number: 9940707
Teacher date of birth: 4 September 1976
NCTL case reference: 14185
Date of determination: 19 July 2016
Former employer: Seaford Head School, East Sussex

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 18 and 19 July 2016 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Ms Rosalind Ramsey.

The panel members were Mr Keith Jackson-Horner (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Tony James (teacher panellist) and Ms Gill Tomlinson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Eve Piffaretti of Blake Morgan LLP, solicitors.

The presenting officer for the National College was Mr Ian Perkins of Browne Jacobson LLP, solicitors.

Ms Ramsey was not present but was represented by Ms Wilson of the National Union of Teachers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded. Part of the hearing was heard in private, namely, Pupil A's oral evidence and submissions relating to Ms Ramsey's health.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 20 May 2016.

It was alleged that Ms Rosalind Ramsey was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst employed at Seaford Head School, East Sussex, between 7 July 2014 and 10 July 2014 she:

1. engaged in an inappropriate relationship and/or failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A in that she:
 - a. became friends with him on Facebook contrary to the school's social media policy;
 - b. was in contact with him by telephone and/or Facebook messages contrary to the school's social media policy;
 - c. kissed him, including:
 - i. on or around 7 July 2014 at Seaford Golf Club;
 - ii. on or around 9 July 2014 in her car;
 - iii. on or around 10 July 2014 in her car;
 - d. had sexual contact with him including:
 - i. on or around 9 July in her car;
 - ii. on or around 10 July 2014 in her car.
2. Uploaded photographs of pupils and published them on her social media account contrary to the school's social media policy.

Ms Ramsey admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) to 1(d) and admitted that her conduct amounts to failing to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A but denied that she engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. She denied that she kissed or had sexual contact with Pupil A willingly. Ms Ramsey admitted the facts of allegation 2.

Ms Ramsey admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in relation to the facts she admitted.

C. Preliminary applications

Proceeding in absence

The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings has been served in accordance with Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession (“the Procedures”). Additionally Ms Wilson confirmed that Ms Ramsey is aware of today's hearing.

The panel decided that the hearing should proceed in the absence of Ms Ramsey for the following reasons:

- the panel considered the seriousness of the case, and the risk of proceeding in Ms Ramsey's absence. Ms Ramsey was represented by Ms Wilson who could present her case.
- Ms Ramsey was aware of today's hearing and has confirmed that she will not be attending. The panel have concluded that she has voluntarily waived her right to attend.
- Ms Ramsey had not requested an adjournment and gave no indication that she would attend at a future date. The panel were satisfied that no purpose would be served by an adjournment.
- the panel took into account the public interest in cases proceeding in a reasonable time.

Submission of additional / late documents

The panel considered the application made on behalf of Ms Ramsey by Ms Wilson for the admission of additional documents not served in accordance with the Procedures. The panel considered whether doing so would be appropriate and in the interests of a fair hearing. The panel noted that the presenting officer had seen see the additional documents and had no objection to their late admission

The panel decided that the documents were relevant to these proceeding and that they should be admitted in the interests of a fair hearing.

Application for the hearing to be in private and to treat Pupil A as a vulnerable witness

In relation to the application on behalf of Ms Ramsey that the whole hearing be held in private, the panel noted the reasons for the application.

There is a presumption that the hearing should take place in public and there is a legitimate public interest in the openness and transparency of the NCTL's disciplinary procedures. This enables scrutiny and upholds public trust and confidence in the

teaching profession. The panel is not satisfied that there are grounds to justify the exclusion of the public from the whole of the hearing in this case.

The public interest in these proceedings taking place in public outweighs Ms Ramsey's right to privacy and the panel are aware from the case papers that this matter is already in the public domain. However, the panel considered whether the interests of justice could be served in some other way than by excluding the public from all of the hearing and in particular whether this case should be considered in part in private, given that Ms Wilson has indicated that Ms Ramsey's health would be part of the case. The panel decided that the matters raised in relation to Ms Ramsey's health are such that her right to privacy outweighs the public interest and that this interest is best served by the hearing going into private session when health issues are to be discussed. The panel asked both parties to bear this mind when presenting the case.

In relation to the application made by the presenting officer to treat Pupil A as a vulnerable witness, the panel noted that the allegations are of a sexual nature and Pupil A is the alleged victim. On that basis, the panel was satisfied that he is a vulnerable witness within paragraph 4.71. The panel considered that the special measures proposed, being the attendance of a witness supporter are necessary to safeguard the interests of Pupil A. The presenting officer applied for Pupil A's evidence to be provided in private. The panel decided that it was in the interest of justice for Pupil A to provide the panel with his evidence in private as it likely to enhance the quality of Pupil A's evidence.

In summary, the panel rejected the application for the whole of the hearing to be conducted in private for the reasons explained. The panel acceded to the presenting officer's application for Pupil A to be treated as a vulnerable witness and for the special measures proposed. The panel decided that his evidence should be provided in private. Furthermore, the panel will hear submissions in relation to Ms Ramsey's health in private.

The panel noted that paragraph 4.59 of the Procedures requires that the decision of the panel should be announced in public.

Amendment of allegation

The presenting officer applied for the allegations to be amended as set out in the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts on page 12 of the bundle. Both parties also noted a typographical error on the Notice of Proceedings and agreed that the particulars of allegation 1(c) should be referred to as 1(c)(i), 1(c)(ii) and 1(c)(iii) rather than 1(c)(a), 1(c)(b) and 1(c)(c).

The panel took into account that the amendments had been agreed between the parties in advance of the hearing. The panel was satisfied that the amendments caused no prejudice and amended the allegation accordingly.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 5 to 15

Section 4: Witness statements – pages 17 to 18

Section 5: NCTL documents – pages 20 to 189

Section 6: Teacher documents – pages 191 to 281

In addition, the panel agreed to accept:

- a signed copy of the signature page of Ms Ramsey's witness statement (an unsigned version of which was already in the bundle). This was added as page 208A;
- health information from an NHS Trust, which was added to the bundle as page 282.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil A, a former pupil at the school called by the presenting officer. This evidence was provided to the panel in private.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel has carefully considered the case before us and has reached a decision.

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Ms Ramsey was employed as head of science at Seaford Head School from 1 September 2000 to January 2015. In the 2013/2014 academic year Pupil A, a year 11 pupil attending the school, transferred to Ms Ramsey's tutor group in December 2013.

Pupil A left the school at the end of year 11. On 23 September 2014, a pupil reported allegations involving Ms Ramsey and Pupil A to a teacher at the school. The school investigated the allegations and Ms Ramsey was suspended and subsequently dismissed. The allegations were referred to the local authority via safeguarding procedures and reported to the police. No further action was taken by the police.

On 7 July 2014, Ms Ramsey became friends with Pupil A on Facebook and she made contact with him by Facebook using a private account to request that he come into school that day to collect his achievement folder. On 7 July 2014, Ms Ramsey met with Pupil A in her office at the school. She also phoned Pupil A later that day to arrange to meet with him again after school and she drove him to a local golf course. Ms Ramsey also met Pupil A in her car outside school premises on 9 July 2014 and 10 July 2014. It was alleged that Ms Ramsey and Pupil A kissed on the 7, 9 and 10 July 2014 and that on 9 and 10 July 2014, they had sexual contact.

It was also alleged that on 11 July 2014 Ms Ramsey uploaded photographs taken at the school prom to her Facebook account.

In making a determination, the panel has weighed the credibility of the evidence of Pupil A against the written evidence provided by Ms Ramsey. In considering this case, the panel noted that Ms Ramsey is a person of previous good character. The panel took this good character into account as a positive factor when considering her evidence and in deciding whether she is less likely than otherwise might be the case to act as alleged. The panel also took into account that Ms Ramsey was an experienced teacher, who had taught at the school for 14 years and that she was the head of science. However, the panel did not have the benefit of hearing direct oral evidence from Ms Ramsey nor had they been able to test her evidence in questioning.

The panel had opportunity to hear direct oral evidence provided under oath by Pupil A. Pupil A presented as a plausible and believable witness. The panel noted that he was honest in recognising or acknowledging his own poor past behaviour record at school. For example, he said that he did not enjoy school, that he was "a bit of a shit", that he did not like some of the teachers, and that he had been rude to them. Pupil A had given a credible explanation for a comment made about another teacher at the school in December 2013, which was unconnected with this case. He had reflected that he was immature and that he shouldn't have said what he did at the time.

Findings of fact

The panel's findings of fact are as follows. In relation to allegation 1, the panel has firstly considered each of the sub-particulars before considering whether they amounted to a failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and / or engaging in an inappropriate relationship.

Whilst employed at Seaford Head School, East Sussex you

1. engaged in an inappropriate relationship and/or failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A in that:

- a. you became friends with him on Facebook contrary to the school's social media policy;**
- b. you were in contact with him by telephone and/or Facebook messages contrary to the school's social media policy;**
- c. kissing took place with him, including:**
 - i. on or around 7 July 2014 at or near Seaford Golf Course;**
 - ii. on or around 9 July 2014 in your car;**
 - iii. on or around 10 July 2014 in your car;**
- d. you had sexual contact with him including:**
 - i. on or around 9 July in your car;**
 - ii. on or around 10 July 2014 in your car.**

Ms Ramsey admitted the facts of allegation 1(a), 1(b), 1(c)(i) – (iii) and 1(d)(i) and (ii).

Ms Ramsey also admitted that her conduct amounted to failing to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A. The panel found this stem of allegation 1 proven on the basis of Ms Ramsey's admissions.

Ms Ramsey denied that she engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

Ms Ramsey's account of the facts admitted in 1(c)(i) to (iii) and 1(d)(i) and (ii) was that, although the activities took place, they were contrary to her express will. She did not willingly allow the events described to occur, nor did she want the events to happen. She accepted, however, that her conduct leading up to the events, through her failure to maintain boundaries towards Pupil A and by agreeing to meet him, on more than one occasion, outside of school, including alone together in her car, permitted the circumstances in which allegations 1(c) and 1(d) were able to occur.

Ms Ramsey also admitted that she had instigated contact outside school with Pupil A by becoming friends with him on Facebook, contrary to the school's social media policy.

Pupil A told us that Ms Ramsey initiated the contact by adding him on Facebook and messaging him to come into school to collect a folder of certificates. Pupil A met Ms

Ramsey in her office on 7 July 2014 and she asked him out after school. Pupil A met with Ms Ramsey after school and she drove him to Seaford Golf Club where they went for a walk. She told him that she liked him and they kissed. The language that he used described the kiss as consensual. He continued to meet with Ms Ramsey and they kissed on other occasions. Pupil A also told us that it was Ms Ramsey who instigated the sexual activity that occurred. He described that he and Ms Ramsey went walking around Crawley holding hands after the sexual contact on 10 July 2014. Pupil A stated that "it was both ways for the kissing. I thought it was a relationship. She said she liked me".

The panel considered all of the evidence. The panel treated the hearsay evidence including opinion evidence contained within the bundle with caution and carefully considered the weight to attach to it. The panel did not consider that the hearsay evidence corroborated Ms Ramsey's account of the contact between her and Pupil A. The only witnesses to the events described were Ms Ramsey and Pupil A and the panel had to determine which of their accounts it preferred. The panel attached greatest weight to the oral evidence provided to it by Pupil A, for the reasons provided above. In addition, the panel noted that Pupil A gave a consistent and more credible account of the circumstances in dispute.

In contrast, the panel did not find Ms Ramsey's account to be credible. She was an experienced teacher and a head of department. The panel concluded that she would have been aware of the importance of safeguarding processes generally within and outside the school environment and of the contents of the school's policies. She would have received regular training in safeguarding. Pupil A had been in Ms Ramsey's tutor group from December 2013 until he left school in July 2014, a period of over 6 months. The panel are satisfied that as his form tutor, Ms Ramsey would have been aware of his challenging behaviour despite her denial of viewing the behaviour management records. The panel noted that there were a significant number of behavioural incidents during this period. The panel did not find Ms Ramsey's reasons for making repeated contact with Pupil A to be credible bearing in mind her experience and knowledge of the pupil.

By her own account Ms Ramsey had initiated contact with Pupil A via Facebook on 7 July 2014 and went on to meet with him on three separate occasions out of school. This included driving him around in her car alone. There were also inconsistencies in Ms Ramsey's written evidence, as highlighted by the presenting officer, which neither the panel nor he had been able to test in questioning.

The panel were not persuaded that the medical information provided by Ms Ramsey was relevant to the nature of the sexual contact that took place nor did it give weight to the "myths and facts" document at pages 237 to 238 of the bundle as it had not been able to explore this with Ms Ramsey nor did it have any expert evidence before it linking this document to Ms Ramsey's evidence.

In conclusion, the panel preferred the evidence of Pupil A and found this account more plausible. On the balance of probabilities the panel believed that this account of the

contact with Ms Ramsey was more likely than not to have occurred. In particular, the panel accepted Pupil A's account of the circumstance of the kissing and sexual contact with Ms Ramsey as set out in allegations 1(c) and 1(d) and further accepted his account of the developing relationship between them, which started when Ms Ramsey's initiated contact via a Facebook friend request. The panel finds that Ms Ramsey was a willing participant and that the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c)(i) – (iii) and 1(d)(i) and (ii), constituted engagement in an inappropriate relationship with a pupil.

The panel found the stem of allegation 1 proven.

Therefore, the panel found the facts of allegation 1 proven in its entirety.

2. Uploaded photographs of pupils and published them on your social media account contrary to the school's social media policy.

Ms Ramsey admitted the facts of allegation 2. She admitted that she uploaded photographs of pupils and published them on her social media account contrary to the school's social media policy and that this was inappropriate. It was agreed that the photographs were limited in number and were photographs of groups of pupils attending school functions which did not contain any indecent content.

The panel found allegation 2 proven on the basis of Ms Ramsey's admission.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 to have been proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Ms Ramsey admitted that her conduct amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel took this admission into account but made its own judgement.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which the panel refers to as "the Advice".

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Ramsey, in relation to the facts found proven, involved serious breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considers that by reference to part two, Ms Ramsey is in breach of the following standards:

- teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
- teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Ramsey fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

In relation to Ms Ramsey's relationship with Pupil A, the panel considered that this originated from a situation in which Ms Ramsey was in a position of trust, as an experienced and longstanding teacher in Pupil A's school. She initiated the contact with Pupil A, who was aged 16 at the time. She allowed this contact to develop beyond appropriate professional boundaries. Ms Ramsey engaged in an inappropriate relationship with a pupil, which persisted over a number of days and which she facilitated by taking Pupil A out in her car.

The panel notes that allegations 1 and 2 took place outside of the education setting. However, in relation to allegation 1, the panel was satisfied that Ms Ramsey's conduct led to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way, in particular pupils were aware of the relationship as evidenced by the reporting of allegations to a member of teaching staff in September 2014.

The panel has also considered whether Ms Ramsey's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel has found that the offence of sexual activity is relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Ms Ramsey is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Ramsey's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute:

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. Further the panel noted that other pupils, staff and the wider school community had become aware of Ms Ramsey's conduct.

The panel therefore finds that Ms Ramsey's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In conclusion, having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 proven, we further find that Ms Ramsey's conduct amounts to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute it is necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the protection of pupils;
- the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Ramsey which involved engaging in an inappropriate relationship with a pupil and failing to maintain appropriate boundaries, we have found that kissing and contact of a sexual nature took place. There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of an inappropriate relationship with a child.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Ramsey were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Ramsey was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Ramsey.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against prohibition, as well as the interests of Ms Ramsey. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position of trust or violation of the rights of pupils;
- sexual misconduct, involving actions of a sexual nature and use of the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of Ms Ramsey's behaviour in this case.

The panel did not accept Ms Ramsey's account that she was acting under duress and was a victim of a sexual assault by Pupil A. In fact the panel found her to be a willing participant in that she initiated and facilitated the development of the relationship. The panel are satisfied that Ms Ramsey's actions were deliberate.

The panel noted that Ms Ramsey did have a previously good work history. The panel were provided with evidence of her effectiveness in her professional role in the hearing bundle. However, the panel were not satisfied that this mitigated the seriousness of Ms Ramsey's conduct.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Ms Ramsey. Accordingly, the panel makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply

to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct. The panel has found factors in Ms Ramsey's behaviour that are incompatible with being a teacher and has set out the behaviours relevant in this case above.

In the light of the panel's finding of fact in this case, it noted that Ms Ramsey's expressions of remorse and regret related to her account as a victim, which the panel did not find credible. Ms Ramsey failed to recognise the impact of her actions on Pupil A and the potential impact on other pupils. The panel did not consider that she has demonstrated any insight into the continuing impact of her conduct on Pupil A.

The panel determined that a review period would not be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendations made by the panel both in respect of sanction and review period.

In this case the panel has found the facts of the case proven and found that those facts amount to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

I have noted that the panel has made reference to part two of the advice published by the Secretary of State, and they found that Ms Ramsey is in breach of the following standards:

- teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

I have also taken into account the guidance published by the Secretary of State. I have also taken into account the need to balance the public interest with the individual interests of Ms Ramsey. I have also taken into account the need to be proportionate.

In this case the behaviours that have been found proven and that are relevant are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position of trust or violation of the rights of pupils;
- sexual misconduct, involving actions of a sexual nature and use of the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

For the reasons set out I support the recommendation of the panel that Ms Ramsey be prohibited from teaching.

I turn next to the matter of a review period. Once again I have weighed the public interest and the interests of Ms Ramsey and have taken into account the need to be proportionate.

I have taken into consideration the mitigation that was put forward on behalf of Ms Ramsey. I note the comments of the panel that "Ms Ramsey did have a previously good work history". I note that the panel were provided with evidence of her effectiveness in her professional role in the hearing bundle.

I have also noted that the panel were not satisfied that this mitigated the seriousness of Ms Ramsey's conduct.

In addition, I have taken into particular account the view of the panel that Ms Ramsey's expressions of remorse and regret related to her account as a victim. I note that the panel did not find this credible. In the view of the panel, Ms Ramsey failed to recognise the impact of her actions on Pupil A and the potential impact on other pupils. I agree with the panel that Ms Ramsey has not demonstrated any insight into the continuing impact of her conduct on Pupil A.

For these reasons I support the recommendation of the panel that this prohibition order should be without a review period.

This means that Ms Rosalind Ramsey is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Rosalind Ramsey shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Ms Rosalind Ramsey has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', with a checkmark at the end.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 21 July 2016

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.